Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP70T00666R000100180026-8

1 3 FFB 1964

MEMORANDEM FOR: Deputy Director (Intelligence)

SUBJECT:

Complementary Studies of the Soviet Venture in

Cuba, 1962

1. Attached are complementary studies reconstructing the Soviet venture in Cuba in 1962: Cuba 1962: Khrushchev's Miscalculated Risk, prepared by the Cifice of Research and Reports (CRR), and The Soviet Missile Base Venture in Cuba, prepared by the DD/I

25X1

25X1

- 2. The two studies concentrate on different bodies of information and emphasize different aspects of the venture. Most of the CHR study is devoted to examining, on an all-source basis, the known, hard facts relevant to the military buildup. It relies hasvily thereafter on the implications of this evidence to support its principal conclusions on questions raised by this Soviet action. The study by the ED/I on the other hand, examines the venture in the context of Soviet Toreign policy, especially the record of Soviet confrontation with the United States. It emphasizes the Soviet reading of the American antagonist at all stages of the venture and attempts to discover why Khrushchev believed, until late in the venture, that the United States would not react militarily.
- 3. Because of these differences, the studies vary greatly in the amount of consideration given to similar aspects of the venture. Whereas the CER study discusses the hard facts of the military buildup in great detail, the study by the DD/I presents them only briefly and relies primarily on the CER study for these facts. Conversely the study by the DD/I discusses in detail the political background of the missile base venture, probable Soviet objectives as suggested by this background, and the USSR's political management of the venture throughout its course -- aspects which the CER study discusses only briefly.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

- A. Working from different bodies of information and along different lines, the studies reach many common conclusions, with respect to both principal and secondary conclusions. Moreover, the conclusions which each reaches separately are compatible with the other's conclusions, although there are differences on a few matters of detail. Among the common conclusions are the following:
  - a. The Soviet approach to Cube was marked initially by omation;
  - b. Bevelopments in 1961 (the Bay of Pigs affair, the Vienna talks, the Berlin Wall, and so on), however, encouraged Ehrushchav to believe that in the event missiles were deployed in Cuba the risk of U.S. military action against either the USER or Cuba would be low;
  - e. Impelled by his felt need to redress the strategic and political balance of power and to acquire a stronger position for future negotiations, Khrushchev decided on the Cuben venture in early 1962;
  - d. The way in which the buildup was carried out (the concurrent deployment of defensive and offensive systems, the failure to conceal or camouflage the development of strategic missile sites, the shipping in of the missiles after the President's warnings of early September, and the failure to bring systems to an operational status as rapidly as possible) augusts that the Soviet authorities believed that the risk of a U.S. military reaction was low; and
  - e. When the full extent of the miscalculation was realized, Khrushchev, recognizing his inferior tactical and strategic position, was first concerned with preventing an escalation of the crisis and, when persuaded that U.S. resolve was firm, withdrew the "offensive" weapons while attempting to salvage as much as possible of the Soviet military presence in Cuba.

25X1

5. Insofer as the CER study draws its facts from hard evidence it probably can be regarded as definitive. Insofer as both studies deal with matters of opinion (the CER study in part, the study by the ID/I in greatest part), neither purports to supply final answers. We believe, however, that the studies together give the best existing account of all facets of the missile base venture — the CER study in its detailed summination of the Soviet military buildup and the study by the ID/I in its detailed consideration of background, motivation, and political management.

25X1

25X1

2

25X1

the	ience both inside ( m in one package to stribution lists, ho	CLA and outside CL many of the reci	studies to a fairly wide A. We propose also to send pients. Many others on our ill require only one or the	_
a. V Can dan sva cap	mple, Mr. McGeorge Ling with plied some of that	material for this in the finished at transmission of	has been prepared for the Administration for ert F. Hennedy who were ing the Cuben crisis, who reconstruction, and who have tudy. Attached is a draft the	<u> </u>
			OFFO E. GREE Assistant Director Research and Paports	
	losures: is stated			

3

25X1

D Relegate to  A 13 February 1964 T
MENORANDUM FOR:
SUBJECT: Complementary Studies of the Soviet Venture in Cuba, 1962
1. Attached are complementary studies both prepared by com-
ponents of our Directorate of Intelligence reconstructing the
Soviet venture in Cuba in 1962: (a) Cuba 1962: Khrushchev's Mis-
calculated Risk, and (b) The Soviet Missile Base Venture in Cuba.
2. The two studies concentrate on different bodies of information and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first
mation and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first
2. The two studies concentrate on different bodies of information and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup, on which it bases its conclusions. The other
mation and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup,
mation and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup, on which it bases its conclusions. The other
mation and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup, on which it bases its conclusions. The other emphasizes the Soviet reading of the American antagonist at all stages
mation and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup, on which it bases its conclusions. The other emphasizes the Soviet reading of the American antagonist at all stages of the venture, and tries especially to answer the question of why
mation and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup, on which it bases its conclusions. The other emphasizes the Soviet reading of the American antagonist at all stages of the venture, and tries especially to answer the question of why Khrushchev thought he could get away with it.
mation and emphasize different aspects of the venture. The first is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup, on which it bases its conclusions. The other emphasizes the Soviet reading of the American antagonist at all stages of the venture, and tries especially to answer the question of why Karushchev thought he could get away with it.  3. I think that you will find things of interest to you in
is devoted mainly to examining the hard facts of the military buildup, on which it bases its conclusions. The other emphasizes the Soviet reading of the American antagonist at all stages of the venture, and tries especially to answer the question of why Khrushchev thought he could get away with it.  3. I think that you will find things of interest to you in both papers facts and conjectures which may help you to fill in

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP7 765666R656400 1800 26-8 GROUP 1 Excluding automatic downers this and section and se